

less likelihood of financing touring companies.

All of this has affected the number of legitimate theaters operating in our country. Up-to-date figures were not available to me at this time, but a well-informed guess is that we have lost 20 percent of our legitimate houses outside of New York in the past 10 years.

Added interesting, if depressing, statistics: Over 75 percent of the new productions fail to recover their original investments. And out of every \$2 invested in the theater, only \$1 is returned.

I believe these figures are many times more convincing than any personal exhortations I might press on you.

However, allowing myself a brief one, I should like to point out that in my opinion the admissions tax is a harsh, discriminatory, and quite unnecessary burden on an otherwise overburdened industry.

"Industry" never seems realistically applicable to our business of putting on plays. We are a cultural endeavor; big words, but surely more accurate. And no other form of cultural endeavor in this country—I speak of concerts and operas specifically—is subject to this or similar type taxation.

As president of the League of New York Theaters and the National Association of the Legitimate Theater, I address you not in behalf of subsidy (on the contrary), but to request that we be allowed to turn back to the theatergoer, the benefit of a 10-percent reduction in the price of theater tickets, which decrease might well bring back to us some portion of the audience we have lost these last few years, not only in New York but across the United States.

The Lindsay bill, H.R. 2518, which abolishes the 10-percent admissions tax, is worthy of support and should be enacted.

The Communist Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1964

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, using socialism in their usual smokescreen fashion Communists in Moscow in 1961 said:

The Socialist world is expanding; the capitalist world is shrinking. Socialism will inevitably succeed capitalism everywhere. Such is the objective law of social development. Communist Party Programme, Moscow, 1961.

Despite statements such as the above, there are many supposedly intelligent people in this Nation who refuse to believe that the Communists are in any way actively attempting to subvert our Government and our way of life. They insist that the Communists have changed and no longer want to take over the world; that they are now following a line of truly peaceful coexistence.

The truth is that Khrushchev boasts "We shall bury you" and the Party Line explains that "peaceful coexistence allows Communists in capitalist lands to lead the masses to their liberation." Lenin, in one of his most famous tracts, stated:

To carry on a war for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie . . . to refuse to temporize and compromise . . . to utilize the conflict of interests among one's ene-

mies . . . is . . . ridiculous in the extreme.

Yet complacent Americans, secure in the knowledge of our powerful military defense, refuse to listen to the voices that warn them that that war is not the only means by which the Communists can and work to conquer the world.

An article in the Fort Lauderdale News of July 28 illustrates most effectively that Americans have become so complacent and Communists so brazenly aware of this that we now see and hear avowed Communists on national television accusing our law enforcement agencies of terroristic tactics and literally inciting riot. How can we remain apathetic to such a blatant threat?

Under unanimous consent I include this fine editorial by Jack McGove at this point in the RECORD.

WHEN AVOWED COMMUNISTS VOICE THREATS ON TV IT'S TIME TO LISTEN

It has often been said that nothing educates a person quicker or more efficiently than being suddenly belted in the chops by a supposed weakling contemptuously disregarded as being too mild or too weak to punch his way out of a paper bag.

The inevitable reaction to such an event is first one of shock and then, perhaps, one of grim determination on the part of the person on the receiving end of the punch not to be fooled a second time.

In a manner of speaking this can be said to characterize the reaction of many people in this country who, up to now, at least, have been deriding the threat of Communists within our own Nation, and who have been deluded into believing this threat exists only in the distorted minds of crackpots or nuts inclined to see a Communist under every bed.

This has particularly applied to civil rights enthusiasts who have completely closed their minds to arguments that Communists have infiltrated this movement and have been partly responsible for converting this entire civil rights issue from a more or less passive and peaceful cause to one of hate and violence.

All during the long months that the focal point of the civil rights issue was centered in the South there was literally no public acceptance of claims by aggrieved southerners that outside agitators with known Communist front connections were playing a leading role in stirring up trouble between the races.

But oh what a difference a few weeks make, and particularly when the focal point of racial trouble has suddenly shifted out of the South and into the populous metropolitan areas of the North.

Now what was previously regarded as only the figment of some crackpot's wild imagination has suddenly become cold and ugly reality. It is difficult to disguise a menace when it appears on a nationwide television network, admits its identity, and openly threatens a city of some 8 million people with renewed violence of the worst sort.

Yet, that is exactly what has happened in the past week as people all across this country have seen with their own eyes admitted Communists appearing before the television cameras, accusing our law-enforcement agencies of terroristic tactics, and threatening a racial blood bath unless their ridiculous demands are met.

To say our people have been shocked by this display of contempt and complete disregard for law and order is the understatement of the year. Now it has become all too clear that what none other than J. Edgar Hoover, the respected head of the FBI, has termed, the "master of deceit," are not only actively associated with the civil rights movement but are doing all they can to stoke it

with such bitter fires of hate and discord that it threatens the peace and safety of our entire Nation.

Can anybody who has seen and heard these admitted Communists spewing forth their messages of violence and hate conclude they pose no danger to our country? Can any decent and clear-thinking citizen believe they and their nasty works are just a mirage existing only in the tortured minds of right-wing extremist groups? And can any citizen, with any kind of a desire to keep our Nation strong and God fearing, truly believe that our national policy of accommodating the Communists not only here at home but all around the world isn't backfiring right back in our face?

We have accepted too long the theory expounded by our Supreme Court that so long as members of the Communist Party in this country don't teach and advocate the overthrow of our Government by force of arms or violence, they are immune from arrest and prosecution.

We have also accepted far too long the idea preached by our State Department that we must accommodate Communist nations and refrain from "rocking the boat" lest they get mad at us and shatter our utopian dreams of creating a peaceful world by compromising with the forces of evil that have always been dedicated to destroying us and all we stand for.

It is time we woke from our complacent sleep here in America and began to accept the fact that the longstanding goal of the Communists to infiltrate our institutions and to divide and conquer us through our own timidity and apathy has been all too successful.

Moderation may be a virtue when it comes to drinking whisky but it adds up to something far less than a virtue when it applies to combating enemies who have pledged to bury us and who aren't averse to starting a racial war in this country to make their gravedigging job that much easier.

This business of glossing over, deriding and underestimating the Communist threat within our own country has gone on too long already, and it's high time our people stopped listening to weak-kneed politicians who can't see the forest for the trees and started heeding the words of warning voiced by J. Edgar Hoover, and others like him, who don't go around wearing rose-colored glasses for fear they will see something unpleasant to spoil their day.

Goldwater and the New GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1964

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am constantly impressed with the fine quality of editorial material that appears in the small county newspapers in the Sixth District of Indiana. One of the newest papers being published in that district is the Brownsburg Guide. Already they have established an excellent editorial policy under the leadership of Don J. Richer and Earl Neese. On July 22, 1964, following the Republican National Convention, an editorial appeared in that paper entitled "Goldwater and the New GOP." I think it will be of interest to all and under unanimous consent I submit this article for printing in the RECORD:

GOLDWATER AND THE NEW GOP

The Republican convention, that grand old spectacle of the Grand Old Party, orated itself to a discordant close Thursday night. From the clashing notes of that political symphony played by two groups of delegates badly out of tune with each other, there has emerged a shaken (but maybe not weakened) party with a new leader.

Neither the new leader, BARRY GOLDWATER, nor his chief contestant, William Scranton, brought harmony back to the ranks. Scranton tried and failed. His plea for unity brought no unity. GOLDWATER hardly tried at all. He welcomed support but said, "Those who do not care for our cause we do not expect to enter our ranks in any case."

And thus the convention closed at the Cow Palace with the wounded minority sounding like bawling calves in a hallstorm and with the overwhelming majority whooping it up in glee.

From these birth pangs of discord a new party has been born with a new leader. The Republican philosophy exemplified by eastern moderates is at least temporarily dead. In its place is a new kind of conservatism that causes great joy in the right wing of the party and horrible shudders in the left. It is yet a long time until November but for now left is left and right is right and little is in between.

The cause of this great Republican gap is best summarized in the 30 words that shook the world. Toward the close of Goldwater's acceptance speech, he said, "I would remind you that extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice. And let me remind you also that moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue."

Those 30 words have caused concern in Europe. In the United States former President Eisenhower, and other Republicans, have asked for a clarification. What do those 30 words mean?

The answer to that question will make the great Republican gap either greater or smaller. To some the meaning is crystal clear. To others, baffling. To still others, frightening. "Why," said one, "it's like reading the Bible. You can read anything into it you want to."

There is truth in that. Perhaps it goes further in explaining the man and his philosophy than all the words that have been written about him. Perhaps GOLDWATER, who rode out of the West gathering the multitudes as he went, can be compared to a mystic the likes of which heretofore could be found in neither party. For is it not true that his disciples believe in him with something like religious fervor and back his cause with something like missionary zeal?

Is it not also true that the man is forthright—refusing to back down from his principles? Certainly he is not underhanded. He announced 4 years ago in Chicago that he was out to gain control of the Republican Party. Then he proceeded to do it. He crisscrossed the country in open sight and plain purpose yet many who saw refused to believe and many who believed could not understand. Only in this light can the impact of the stunning defeat of the moderates and the complete Goldwater victory be fully comprehended.

And yet there are those respected and solid Republicans who cannot find it in their hearts to vote for him. Said one, "We have already tried the things he wants to do and they have failed. I am not proud of it but for the first time in my life I'm going to vote Democratic." Conversely, one Democrat said he was going to vote for GOLDWATER because he liked what GOLDWATER said at the convention. And then there are GOLDWATER's enthusiastic young backers who will be busy with person-to-person campaigning. They will produce votes. You can't buy that kind of support.

But will it be enough? Can GOLDWATER win? Yes, but he heads a minority party shaken to the very core of its being. Compounding the picture is Governor Wallace's withdrawal from the presidential race and the effects of the civil rights law which is, no matter what anyone says, a burning issue.

Out of this confusing picture only a couple of things are clear: The voters are really going to have a choice this fall, and the Republican Party, whether for better or worse, is going to be different.

National Wilderness Preservation System**SPEECH**

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9070) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, during the 64 years since the turn of the century, much of the scenic wealth of the wilderness in the United States has been wiped out, but parts of it do remain. However, without protection, only a small fraction of what does remain would have a possibility of surviving for others to know in future years. Through enactment of H.R. 9070, the National Wilderness Preservation System bill, approximately 2 percent of the more than 2 billion acres of our national land area will be preserved for posterity.

Wilderness is a valuable resource which increases in value as it shrinks in size both on maps and with respect to the number of people it must serve. This is so demonstrably true that wilderness legislation, which some thought would lose its impact shortly after it was introduced, is more alive today than ever.

True wilderness is not a renewable resource. Once cut over or otherwise exploited, it is no longer an undisturbed natural area. Although quasi-wilderness areas for recreational use can be redeveloped over a century in once-exploited regions, the chain of natural forces responsible for the existence of soil, microscopic biological life, for plants and wildlife will have been interrupted and ended, and an entirely new ecological cycle—the result of man's influence—will have resulted.

Unless the existing areas of true wilderness are reserved now, the influence of man is inevitably going to consume all that we have. There will be roads and commercial operations, campsites, and facilities which will not only mar scenic beauty but destroy natural values found only in undisturbed areas.

Ultimately the U.S. Government is going to have to provide areas affording its citizens an opportunity to "get back to nature," and to escape the pressures of modern life.

We can do it now, without expense to the National Treasury and with little or

no disturbance to established private rights and community economies, or we can wait and spend tens of millions of dollars later trying to recapture a few tracts to rebuild into secondhand, quasi-wilderness.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the purpose of the wilderness bill. It is simply an effort to achieve a highly desirable national objective—the preservation of significant wilderness tracts still owned by the U.S. Government—with as little adverse effect as possible on individuals, on private institutions, and on the economy of communities, regions, and the Nation.

Vigorous opposition to the wilderness bill has come from groups with a real and legitimate concern over the restriction of the use of portions of federally owned lands. The opponents have said that the commodity resource value on all unexploited lands are greater than the wilderness values, and make wilderness preservation a luxury the Nation cannot afford. But the measure before us today does not envisage the dedication of all unexploited lands. Commercial timberlands in dedicated wilderness areas comprise just a small percentage of the total acreage, and are small indeed when compared with the vast acreage outside wilderness which, once cut, still needs to be restocked. There exists no need for known or unknown mineral values in dedicated wilderness and, if present, such minerals should be our bequest to the future in case of dire need.

Opponents also say that wilderness legislation will "lock up" needed commodity resources forever. This, I believe, simply is not true. No law, no matter how strong, can withstand the pressures of a real need. By passing this badly-needed wilderness legislation at this time, both wilderness and other resources can be delivered to the future in one package. Then, if our technology fails to give us new materials which will be needed in the future, the entire wilderness concept can be reviewed in the light of the needs then existing.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of H.R. 9070.

Vietnam Views**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, Charles L. Sefrit was for many years, until his retirement in 1960, the general manager of the daily Bellingham Herald in my district. Even in retirement, however, he has continued an active interest in world, national and local affairs.

Recently, he completed a trip around the world, during which he got a firsthand look at the American involvement in South Vietnam. What he saw caused him to form some strong opinions about the situation in southeast Asia, and he

1964

presented these opinions in a column published in the Herald on his return.

Because his views are based on personal observation and the close questioning of officials in southeast Asia, I think they will be particularly interesting to Members of Congress. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following column by Charles L. Sefrit to be inserted in the RECORD:

VIETNAM VIEWS

(By Charles L. Sefrit)

One cannot understand, from the available facts, why the United States is in Vietnam, even when you go there. That the State Department has not been fair with the American people in its news releases is quickly understood.

We have been told that our giving over \$1 million of taxpayers' money a day and sending some 20,000 U.S. troops there is to save Vietnam from going Communist.

The tragedy to taxpayers is that in my opinion the State Department and President know it's already lost and has been for some time.

China all but had enough Chinese in Vietnam to take over the Government by infiltration before we stepped in.

We were told by a reliable source over 40 percent of the total population are Chinese. Thirty percent are Vietnamese, twenty percent India and Hindu and mixed natives and ten percent all others, including European, mixed white race, and Japanese.

HARD TO DISTINGUISH

We were told you cannot tell a loyal Chinese from a Communist and living together either in the cities or throughout the country, they come and go at will and are well protected when they need to be. They look, dress, and work together and hide away as guerrillas.

All able-bodied men, by South Vietnam Government decree, are subject to draft as native soldiers. No one knows who is a loyal citizen of the recognized government or which soldier is loyal.

The United States is all alone. With no other nation's support, with its pitiful forces spread thin among the millions of Vietnamese, it is virtually useless to defend themselves from the millions of Chinese guerrillas hiding everywhere.

These guerrillas can organize overnight and attack most everywhere, and carry out their taking-over process by wiping out one native village after another and then filling it with Chinese by infiltration. But these are city Chinese, getting foodstuffs from the million dollars a day we U.S. taxpayers unload on the wharves in Saigon and elsewhere and pour out for relief.

ARMS NOT SEEN

All of the cargo we could see unloaded from the many ships pouring in supplies was mostly foodstuff. There were no signs of war materials going from the ships in a dock area of over a half mile.

They unloaded directly to waiting trucks and handled cargo only once—something unheard of on any U.S. dock. Then the stevedore crew climbed aboard and off they went. A new crew was loading nearby to take over.

We examined the huge warehouses along the docks and found them empty except for a few miscellaneous items. The dock area is fenced in and U.S. Marines and military policemen guard the area, a large part of the shipping waterfront of Saigon, a city of estimated 1,800,000 population.

Where the supplies went, no guard, Army or Marine, could tell us. They confessed they were not told.

How smart are the Chinese behind the scenes? Well, they have outsmarted our State Department brain trusters and President's advisers so thoroughly they don't know what to do.

If the United States tries an all-out military buildup to win, what could we win? More Chinese would move down the coast to the lower delta country and hit from the rear and more from the north and for every U.S. soldier, they can afford to lose a thousand, though unfortunately they don't. They know how to live on little, and jungle and swamps are no hazard. They have lived that life since childhood.

We have fallen into a very cunning trap by the Chinese war lords.

An all-out offensive means an exchange of American casualties for Chinese, and they have drawn the United States into a new world war—what the Formosa nationalists wants, as well as the Russians.

CAN'T EXPECT HELP

We will have no support from France or England. It's our war and they all want the United States to be reduced in power.

Russia would only come in when they saw an advantage. We would have to rearm Japan to keep a balance of military power to come to our aid. Communist-controlled European countries would revolt. The atom fury could bring a change in all the world. That's the risk of our all-out offensive.

It seems to me we should pull our forces out of the lost cause of Vietnam and be big enough to admit our mistake and let China try to carry out our job of feeding and giving away taxpayers' money to south Asia. The risk we are now taking for stopping a little country from going Communist is not a drop in the bucket to the total risk of all-out war with China. In that part of Asia we have little chance for local support and it is an area of terrific military disadvantages.

The waste of good taxpayers' money should be stopped immediately from going into a country already lost to communism.

Testimony Given by Jack Golodner, Before the Ways and Means Committee, Urging That the 10-Percent Federal Admissions Tax on Live Dramatic Performances Be Abolished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee held hearings on the repeal of the 10-percent admissions tax for live dramatic performances. Among others who testified on H.R. 2518, the Lindsay bill to repeal the 10-percent tax, and other bills of like purpose, was the representative of Actors Equity Association, Jack Golodner.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point Mr. Golodner's excellent testimony asking for the repeal of the tax:

STATEMENT OF JACK GOLODNER, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, ACTORS EQUITY ASSOCIATION, AT HEARINGS ON EXCISE TAXES CONDUCTED BY THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, AUGUST 3, 1964

My name is Jack Golodner. I am legislative representative of the Actors Equity Association, and I am appearing in behalf of the association, the oldest continuing organization devoted to the welfare of the American stage performer and the development of the legitimate theater.

The professional actors, actresses, and stage managers that comprise Equity's membership are well aware of the considerable attention which this committee gave their pleas for income averaging last year. The reform which you initiated, hopefully, will do much to relieve the American performer of an inequity he has borne for many years. But the distressing economic condition of the American actor which was described to you last year by Equity's now-retired president, Mr. Ralph Bellamy, obviously will not be corrected by this action—important as it may be.

The legitimate theater in America is an economically stagnant industry typified by high unemployment, substandard wages, diminishing returns on capital investment and decreasing opportunities for employees and investors. The U.S. census reports there were 13,488 professional actors in the country in 1960, a decline of 26 percent since the 1950 census. And the greater part of this 13,500 are finding it increasingly difficult to practice their art. According to a recent Occupational Outlook Handbook published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, "The great majority are struggling for a toehold in their profession, glad to pick up small parts whenever and wherever they can. Most actors have employment in their profession for only a small part of the year. Because of the frequent periods of unemployment characteristic of this profession, annual earnings are low for all but a very few of the best known performers."

The Bureau of Labor Statistics advises young Americans against seeking careers in the performing arts.

It is no exaggeration of the situation to say that in many areas of our country the professional theater is subsidized by the American performer working for poverty level wages and substandard economic benefits. It is little wonder that many among America's truly talented youth are following the Labor Department's advice and abandoning plans for careers in our theaters.

Faced with this situation, Actors Equity is convinced that the continued imposition of the present admissions tax can only hasten the demise of the American theater as we know it. We respectfully submit that continuation of this tax would be detrimental to the industry, to the artists who are employed by it and to the general public that directly and indirectly benefits from the products of the living theater.

The admissions tax on the legitimate theater returns little revenue to the Treasury and cannot constitute a worthwhile element of our tax structure. I believe it has been estimated that not more than \$6 million is derived from the tax on admissions to the legitimate theater.

It is a highly regressive tax. Theater does not enjoy an inelastic demand. Except in the case of the very few smash hits which experience fantastic and often unexplainable demands, theatergoers are very sensitive to cost.

Certainly, at a time when unemployment in the industry is high and opportunities for serious creative work are diminishing, such a tax is most unfortunate.

It is an unfair, discriminatory tax. The legitimate theater has been forced to face stiff competition from movies and from television. It is unfair that Government imposes a tax burden on each live performance a person experiences while no similar tax is imposed on the viewing of a televised show. It is not fair for Congress to exempt the greater portion of movie admissions and offer no similar benefit to the live theater.

In this situation the admissions tax is setting the cultural benefits of live professional theater further beyond the means of our people and accentuating a shift to films and TV.

If, when we use the term "luxury" we are referring to items which only the rich can afford, then, indeed, this tax is helping to

August 3

make theater a luxury for the wealthy few. It is Equity's contention that the living theater is not and should not become such a luxury.

The living theater is and always has been an integral element in the culture of modern society. Rather than tax it as a plaything of the rich, we should be thinking of ways to make it more readily available to greater numbers of our people. If there is value in being taught the writing of Aeschylus, Moliere, and Ibsen; if there is advantage to reading Shakespeare, Checkhov, and O'Neil; if our Government today deems it wise to expend funds to help educate our children in the literature of the theater and to make drama available on the shelves of our libraries, how can it tax the performance of those plays as a luxury? How can it shackle the industry that would develop new bodies of literature? There is an inconsistency here which should not be furthered.

I realize that the use of the term "luxury" applied to certain excises has led to unending argument—a situation which reflects the truth of a 17th century playwright's observation that "one man's poison is another's meat or drink." However, if selective taxes are to be a part of our tax system this committee must continue to make value judgments regarding products and services. To say that we levy "luxury" taxes where they fall upon the shoulders of those most able to pay provides no escape from such decisions.

There are many things today which are beyond the reach of those of modest means in education, in cultural areas, in goods and services. Where should Government lessen the gap, where increase it?

If quality theater has become a cultural experience which only the wealthy can afford, is this situation to be deplored and corrected or continued by the extension of a tax which makes legitimate theater even more expensive?

True, there is a practice of theatergoing that caters to whimsy and should only be indulged by the rich. I refer to the insistence on choice seats at choice plays at choice times. People who make such demands are willing to pay high prices, and if the revenue be required, the tax can fall on this practice. However, its imposition on other shoulders is only helping deter our people (especially our young people) from a cultural opportunity they deserve and want and discourages the employment of America's vast reservoir of creative talent.

Last year, August Heckscher, President Kennedy's Special Consultant on the Arts, completed a year long evaluation of the relationship between our national government and America's artists and art institutions. He found that "many Government policies ostensibly having nothing to do with the arts affect them in a substantial way—often adversely." One of these is the admissions tax. And in his report to the President, Mr. Heckscher had this to say regarding the excise:

"Other countries give positive support to their theaters; the United States by contrast 'penalizes' the theater by imposition of a 10-percent admissions tax. Such a tax has been considered a legitimate excise tax traditionally levied on 'luxuries.' It has been defended on the ground that its remission would not necessarily have the effect of lowering prices or benefiting the actor or playwright. But the theater is not a mere 'luxury.' And it is quite possible to insure that a tax saving will be used in ways to advance the true interests of the theater and of the acting profession. The repeal of the Federal admissions tax on the legitimate theater, especially if combined with other acts aimed at promoting the American stage, would give a vital stimulus to this basic and enduring art form."

Thus, while advocating removal of the admissions tax, Mr. Heckscher points out that the effect of such a move rests upon the use made of this tax saving by the industry. Actors Equity believes most strongly that the value of remission can be dissipated by the subsequent actions of the industry, and therefore we hope that you will examine the plans of the industry carefully. We are concerned, as Mr. Heckscher is, that remission of the tax would not lower prices and make the art of theater more accessible to more people, that an end to the tax would merely make the successful hit show producer richer and do little for the valuable artistic work of limited appeal.

Equity fully endorses the position expressed by Mr. Nathaniel Goldfinger of the AFL-CIO when he said in his earlier testimony before this committee that "Justification for the reduction or elimination of excises is based on the assumption that the equity of the tax structure will be increased and the restraint on consumption will be lifted. These ends can be achieved only if those who now bear the burden of these taxes are directly benefited by the reduction. If excises are cut, but if revenue lost by the Federal Government is simply pocketed by the enterprises whose goods and services are no longer taxed, the result will be unconscionable."

In behalf of the AFL-CIO, Mr. Goldfinger urged this committee "to seek evidence that the public will, in fact, be the beneficiary of excise cuts. Moreover," he said, "we urge the committee to make its intent clear that the benefits of the elimination or reduction of excises . . . be passed through to the consuming public."

Unfortunately, pledges to reduce the cost of theater tickets in the past have not been uniformly made or adhered to by the operators of our legitimate theaters. For various reasons, promises to pass on the 1954 reduction were not effective. Again, last winter, although the League of New York Theaters and the National Association of the Legitimate Theater told various Senators of an intention to keep ticket prices down, some producers expressed doubt that they would pass on the tax remission.

Mr. Chairman, the decision of Actors Equity to come before you and ask for repeal of the admissions excise on the legitimate theater was made in reliance upon recent pledges made by the producers organizations that the reduction will be passed through to the public. We earnestly hope that this committee will recognize the importance of such a step and insist that it be taken by the industry.

If a satisfactory commitment to pass on a tax repeal cannot be obtained then we say let the industry demonstrate its desire to use the returned revenue to promote the American stage in a constructive manner. Mr. Howard Taubman, drama critic for the New York Times has suggested one way which might be considered. He suggests that the industry establish a trust fund which would receive the moneys now siphoned away by the tax. "Such money," Mr. Taubman explains, "could be used in a variety of constructive ways. It could be spent on fellowships for promising writers. It could pay for performances for schoolchildren. It could send first-class theater on tour to areas that never see live professional actors." In addition, the fund could provide a source for low-interest capital to pay for much needed physical improvements in the commercial theater. If such a fund were to be established in advance of congressional action, there would be little doubt of the industry's intent to employ the money in a constructive manner.

Actors Equity believes with Mr. Heckscher that repeal of the admissions excise could provide a major stimulus to the American

theater. But this will happen only if coupled with a price decrease or other acts designed to bring more theater to more people. We hope that this committee will insist that the industry come forward with an effective program to serve this goal.

Remarks of C. H. Kwock, Editor of Chinese World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1964

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. C. H. Kwock is the editor of the Chinese World, one of the Nation's largest bilingual daily newspapers. He is a scholar and man of wisdom whose dedication to the principles of justice and human dignity have repeatedly been attested to by his forthright and fearless editorial comment.

Mr. Kwock came to Washington, and in a simple but moving ceremony before the statue of Abraham Lincoln at the Lincoln Monument, read the following words.

These words are a personal credo, a personal rededication. They are words which all Americans should ponder well.

REMARKS OF C. H. KWOCK, EDITOR OF CHINESE WORLD

Moved by reverence and gratitude, I have come to stand here as a representative of my fellow Chinese-Americans—to this quiet place, sacred to the memory of the Great Emancipator.

It has been more than a century since President Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation. Four generations have been born and grown to manhood since the end of that great and dreadful conflict which decided that these United States of America must be one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The path to such unity, to such liberty and justice, has been steep and arduous.

Even now, at the end of a hundred years, these goals have not been completely won.

Only this summer, the civil rights bill, which so greatly implements the principles of equal democracy for all, has become law.

Yet, immigration legislation, which would extend the guarantees of democracy without discrimination to immigrants of every race and nation, is still in committee, awaiting the will of Congress.

Both these massive extensions of human rights and brotherhood were chiefly the work of another great President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who was martyred last year by an assassin's bullet—just as Abraham Lincoln was martyred a century ago.

There are many minorities in this country. I belong to one, made up of Chinese-Americans.

When President Lincoln signed his Emancipation Proclamation, only a few of my people had arrived in this country. But they were already giving their toil and sweat to build this great Nation.

Yes, I belong to one minority group. But I know that all minorities, taken together, make up one great majority. In that majority, all the blood that flows through the veins of all men is red. That, at least they have in common. And when at length they lie in the grave, all their bones turn white.